

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application. Claims 1, 9-11, 13-14, 16, 21-22, and 25-27 have been amended herein. Claims 8, 12, and 24 have been canceled. Care has been exercised to introduce no new matter. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-23, and 25-27 are pending and are in condition for allowance.

Objections

Several amendments to the specification were made in the prior Amendment and Response, filed June 30, 2008, in order to overcome Examiner's Objection to the Specification and to make certain minor corrections. Since said objection to the specification was not maintained, and since no new objection was made in the Office Action mailed Oct. 21, 2008, please let the record show that all of said amendments have been entered and are acceptable to Examiner.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-8, 12-20 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0110468 in view of Ellis, U.S. Publication No. 2008/1084327. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 16, and 22 have been amended to include a system and method claim element of "a wireless signal receiver, *comprising a singular wireless interface which is operational with a wireless networking card and a computing device.*" The prior art of record, neither singly nor in any combination, discloses a single wireless interface which is operational with both a wireless networking card and a computing device. This provides a clear

advantage of requiring just one wireless interface instead of multiple wireless interfaces. Therefore, remote computer controls, such as a wireless keyboard, a wireless mouse, or a wireless camera could be used with no additional wireless interface required. Claims 1, 16, and 22 are now in allowable form. As such, dependent claims 2-7, 13-15, 17-20, and 23 are also allowable, at least for the reasons stated above with regard to independent claims 1, 16, and 22. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8, 12-20 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman in view of Ellis.

Claims 9-11, 21 and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman in view of Ellis in further view of Parker et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0234804. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 16, and 22 are now in allowable form, as discussed above, over the prior art of record of Perlman in view of Ellis. Parker is simply drawn to a system and method of viewing a computer monitor from a distance, and does not cure the deficiencies of Perlman and Ellis. Claims 9-11, 21, and 25-27 are also in condition for allowance, for at least these reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-11, 21 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman in view of Ellis in further view of Parker.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-23, and 25-27 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 202-783-8400 or nberezny@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

/NEMA BEREZNY/

Nema Berezny
Reg. No. 57,706

NOB/bp
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550